

MEETING MINUTES -- SPAARC

Meeting of May 17, 2019

Members In Attendance: Andrew Mattson (co-chair), Michael Kinane (co-chair), Len Davis, Thomas Del Guidice, Wayne Edwards, Linval Frazer, Amanda Frisken, Laura Gallagher, Jason Kaloudis, William Kimmins, Mary Marquez Bell, Eliliana Martinez, Runi Mukherji, Patrick O’Sullivan, Evan Rufrano, Stephanie Schneider, Usama Shaikh, Jessica Smith

Members Absent: Kaela King

(Note: Minutes presented in order of the meeting agenda)

I. Welcome and Introductions

The co-chairs welcomed all in attendance and each member of the group introduced themselves by name and title. The co-chairs noted the importance of the work of this committee as it relates to the expectations of Middle States Commission on Higher Education as they relate to transparency and participation in campus planning. Discussion focused on the need for the Committee to ensure the College was working towards the goals of its strategic plan, to assess progress being made towards the success of the College in achieving its plan, and to keep the campus informed of that progress. Prof. Mattson also noted that SPAAR will need to integrate its work into the widespread effort being mobilized concerning the campus’ upcoming Middle States self-study.

II. SPAAR Background

The co-chairs reviewed the work that had come before the development of the SPAAR committee: The collaborative efforts led by the College President and Faculty Senate that ultimately resulted in the College’s current strategic plan and the same collaboration that led to the development of the SPAAR task force, which completed its work in fall 2018. All were reminded that the charge for SPAAR and its composition were agreed to without revision by both the College President and the Faculty Senate.

III. Creating a Work Plan

Work Orientation

The co-chairs reported that, in the deliberations of the SPAARC Task Force, the idea had been proposed of having subcommittees created to go about gathering information and conducting the assessment of the College’s progress. The co-chairs proposed two options for those subcommittees: Groups organized around the goals of the plan or groups

organized around the operational/divisional lines of the College. The co-chairs noted their preference for a structure organized around the operational/divisional lines of the College. Mr. Kinane noted his belief that it would be more efficient to collect information in this way and enable each subcommittee to become “content experts” on those areas of the College and their efforts in support of the plan and the ultimate success of the College.

Concerns were raised that this structure might not break through the siloes between operational areas that it was generally agreed exist on campus and that a goal-focused approach would offer a different approach where the aspirations of the College were paramount.

A suggestion was made to forgo a subcommittee structure and instead have all areas of the College present information to the full SPAAR committee. Those current SPAAR members who had been involved in past campus-wide committees related to planning and budgeting reported that past groups had had trouble with such presentations because the dynamics of large-group meetings led to less depth of conversation and, in some cases, to a focus on “pet projects” rather than the priorities of the College. The idea was raised that such presentations (perhaps one or two divisions annually) could take place so that, over a three-year period all major lines of operation would have an opportunity to educate SPAAR on its work, its assessment, and its needs.

Also noted as key in whatever structure was decided, the subcommittees would need clear direction on the outcomes they are to produce. The development of a rubric was discussed with Dr. Del Guidice volunteering to work with the co-chairs on an initial draft, which will be sent to the Committee for comment early in the summer.

After each member was asked to give their sense of the best course to pursue, Mr. Shaikh made a motion that the Committee develop subcommittees based on operational/divisional lines. Dr. Mukherji seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Subcommittee Development

The group discussed the number of subcommittees to be developed and subject matter to be assigned to each. Most of the discussion centered on the placement of human resources. After discussion, Dr. O’Sullivan made a motion, with a second by Dr. Frazer that the five subcommittees be created as follows:

1. Academic Affairs/Enrollment Services
2. Advancement/Communications/HR
3. Business/Finance
4. Capital/Facilities/Security-UP

5. Student Affairs

The motion passed without dissent.

Regarding membership on the committees, the idea was discussed about adding key non-committee members to each group. It was agreed by consensus that, in these early stages of development of SPAAR, that the groups would be populated only by members of SPAAR but that the subcommittees had the ability to seek out information and participation from all corners of campus.

Each Committee member volunteered for the subcommittees in which they had the most interest. The co-chairs agreed to take that information and send as soon as possible to the members a list of subcommittee assignments.

Timelines

The SPAARC charge calls for two meetings each semester and it was agreed that such a schedule be used for the first semester of work and that other meetings could be added if deemed necessary by the Committee.

The co-chairs proposed the following as the timing for the work of SPAAR:

- **Fall 2019:** Subcommittees work to assess progress towards the goals of the College's strategic plan and to gain insight into how the campus plans and executes its work. A report on these reviews (written or verbal to be determined) will be presented to SPAAR late in the fall.
- **Winter/Early Spring 2020:** Subcommittees and divisional staff develop requests for strategic initiatives/projects for consideration in the 2020-21 budget cycle.
- **Late Spring (April) 2020:** SPAAR reviews and discusses the strategic requests, determining a prioritized set of recommendations that is distributed to the campus.

Discussion centered on the reasonableness of the schedule as described, how this schedule fit with the College's overall budget planning schedule, and whether other meetings might be required.

While no vote was taken, there was general agreement on the schedule and proposed deliverables (subcommittee reports, requests for strategic investment, SPAAR recommendations).

IV. Other Issues & Questions

The co-chairs reported that they had received from members a request that designees/proxies be able to attend meetings of the Committee when an assigned member could not attend due to a major conflict. A lengthy discussion ensued which included

whether such designees would be fully informed on workings of the group, whether they would have voting rights, whether the allowance of designees lessened the importance of attendance by assigned members, how such designees impacted similar committees in the past, and more.

Following discussion, Mr. Rufrano made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Shaikh, to allow SPAAR members to send designees and allow them to have voting rights. Dr. Mukherji requested an amendment to remove the voting rights provision, to which Mr. Rufrano agreed. The motion to allow SPAAR members to send designees who do not have voting rights then failed by a vote of 10-8.

Following the vote, several members of the committee expressed as an imperative the need to create a meeting schedule for SPAAR as soon as possible so that its members could avoid conflicts. The co-chairs agreed to do so.

With no further motions or questions, the meeting was adjourned.

Prepared by: Michael Kinane